

EPA Official Record

Notes ID: E9FFA03D946E5C57852577DD006717AF

From: "Rigassio-Smith, Anita" <Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com>

To: Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA

Copy To: "Fox, Steve \ (New Bedford\)" <Steve.Fox@jacobs.com>

Delivered Date: 04/14/2009 02:17 PM EDT

Subject: Next Question: CAD Cell Capacities

Hi Dave,

After our conversations yesterday, I worked through the volume calculations with the sequence of 2 more years of hydraulic dredging, build (City) LHCC, then build UHCC. It makes economical sense to dispose of the UH MU material into the UHCC and to dispose of the LH MU material (south of Coggeshall St. Bridge) into the LHCC. So, I assumed the following:

2 years (2009 and 2010) of hydraulic dredging with T&D disposal
contaminated organics from construction of UHCC to LHCC [18,300 cy]
material from MU33-37 to LHCC [167,031 cy]
remaining (not dredged through 2010) material from MU1-24, -102, -105 to UHCC
[115,796 cy]
material from MU25-32 to UHCC [114,684 cy]

The attached spreadsheet shows the volume balance for the two CAD cells with the above assumptions. The effect of an extra year of hydraulic dredging results in too much capacity in the CAD cells.

For the purpose of the \$80M/year scenario, should I reduce the volume of the UHCC to something like 230K cy or 240K cy; and that for the LHCC to something like 190K cy?

Anita

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is

strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer. -
Vol & Disp Assump_Apex Alt 1_2Cellrev0.xls